

**GUIDELINES TO MAINSTREAM SOCIAL INCLUSION IN PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION EVALUATIONS**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the MSc Social Development Practice**

Word Count: 14 892

DIANA DASTE MARMOLEJO

Development Planning Unit

University College London

Submitted 01/09/10

ABSTRACT

There is an increasing awareness of the relation between transportation systems, mobility and social inclusion. Transportation as a form of mobility is part of the options people have to access desired goods, services, spaces and social activities. Considering this, public transportation is an important space for policy makers to respond with inclusive transportation options based in comprehensive processes and projects that meet the needs of the population to avoid transport related exclusion.

However, evaluations for this kind of projects are still done using mainly an economic criteria leaving wider dimensions of social development unattended.

Evaluations which ignore the relation between public transportation and human development can lead to unfavorable implications for more sustainable forms of development, constituting a reversal from a social development perspective. For this reason, this analysis seeks to show how projects claimed a success from an economist approach may be evaluated as prejudicial from a human development perspective. The objective of this paper is to recommend a set of elements to be considered to mainstream social inclusion and social development in public transportation evaluations.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BRT - Bus rapid transit

CBA - Cost Benefit Analysis

EIA -Environmental Impact Assessments

LAMATA - Lagos Metropolitan Area Transport Authority

LASTMA - Lagos State Traffic Management Authority

LUTP - Lagos Urban Transport Project

PRA – Participatory Rural Appraisal

PLA – Participatory Learning Assessment

SEU - Social Exclusion Unit

SIA – Social Impact Assessment

SSATP - Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program

UNDP – United Nations Development program

VIT – Victoria Institute of Transport

WSSD – World summit for Social Development

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the DPU because its commitment with development not only enriched me with critical thinking but gave me the tools for constructive criticism in pursuing positive change. I particularly want to thank my Supervisor, Dr. Julio Davila for his valuable guidance for this piece of work and during the course. I also thank Robinson Rojas for transmitting to me his conviction when seeking justice and finding truth. I certainly thank Julian Walker and Patrice North for all their support and contributions and the whole staff for their responsiveness in any eventuality.

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. POSITIONS, CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES	12
2.1 Social Development and Human development	12
2.2 Good governance as inclusive citizenship	13
2.3 The multiple dimensions of exclusion	15
2.4 Social inclusion: Social struggle against adversity	16
2.4.1 Access: The link between mobility and inclusion	19
2.4.2 Transportation, mobility options and good governance	20
2.5 Evaluation techniques for developmental infrastructure	23
2.5.1 Cost Benefit Analysis	24
2.5.2 Social Impact Assessment	27
3. INCLUSION, DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT	30
4. LAGOS BRT: EVALUATION OF A SUCCESSFUL SCHEME	33
4.1 Misleading recognition	36
4.2 Instrumental participation	37
4.3 Representation, participation and 'top down' ownership	39
4.4 Compensation as redistribution	41
4.5 Silent equity as outcome	42
4.6 Evaluation as a variable	43
The shaping of policies.....	43
Representation and accountability	44
Other alternatives	45
5. CONCLUSIONS	46

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this paper is to identify a minimum of elements that should be considered when evaluating public transportation projects and processes from a social development perspective. This paper considers the aim of public transportation projects to be the generation of more inclusive societies and therefore the analysis focuses in identifying core elements of social inclusion and the social and political dimensions of evaluations, particularly regarding public transportation. The paper proposes a series of elements advocating for a multidimensional approach to public transportation that mainstreams social inclusion in its evaluations.

This paper seeks to demonstrate that evaluating developmental processes using efficiency as a main criterion based on productivity, economic sustainability and consumption is not only insufficient but detrimental to advance in the achievement of holistic development. These kinds of evaluations not only tend to be mistaken in their assumptions regarding wider social realities but disempowering when considering social inclusion. Likewise, using this narrow approach to evaluate public transport interventions undermines the analysis of core dimensions of social development and social inclusion, operating as an exclusive mechanism that reinforces social exclusion and social exclusion related to transport.

In order to demonstrate this, the research uses as variables key components of social inclusion and the principles of the human development approach to analyse how these could be addressed in an inclusive evaluation processes. It also analyses which transport related categories should be considered in order to adequately recognize the needs of different identities and prevent transport related social exclusion. The analysis of these aspects results in a series of elements to be integrated in transportation evaluations. In order to test these recommendations, these elements later guide the analysis of an evaluation based on a CBA [¹] method. While exposing the limitations of the CBA the paper emphasizes on the desirability to mainstream socially inclusive variables in public transportation evaluations.

The discussion is framed within the wider debate of which perspective to use when evaluating development interventions and the implications of using different approaches. It believes that the methods used to evaluate development result from

¹ See table of abbreviations and acronyms

the way development is conceived and that planning and evaluations of development interventions are not restricted only to technical exercises but arise also from ideological positions. Evaluations praising successful interventions, contesting detrimental implications of these or suggesting changes to institutional practices may determine the permanency, modification or discontinuity in models of development. Evaluations of public projects are particularly impactful in shaping wider policies and suggesting the roles and responsibilities of the State and are, for this reason, a key element in influencing social and political relations.

The CBA is a technique aligned with a neoliberal paradigm of development which emphasizes on economic growth to pursue development and measures its outcomes in terms of efficiency. At a national level, the neoliberal model pursues efficiency by reducing the size of the state, limiting its responsibilities towards citizens and passing many of its functions to the private sector. Citizenship and rights are as a result conditioned to the ability to consume and acquire these from the market. (Dangino, 2007; Kabeer, 2005).

Inclusion is therefore interpreted as a process of expansion in the number and proportion of consumers and producers within a society. From this perspective, urban public transportation systems are mainly concerned with improving the physical articulation of cities with a view to increasing the efficient exchange of people, goods and services and the integration of a broad base of users with the aim of generating greater material wealth for society. Evaluations consequently focus on technical and economic issues to determine the success of these projects with efficiency as an end.

From a social development perspective development is enhancing peoples' choices, capabilities and freedoms (UNDP, 2010). Citizens are not seen as consumers but as subjects of rights and therefore, state and society have the responsibility to remove the obstacles and provide the conditions for individuals to participate in their own development. Social inclusion is understood as a process based on the respect of rights and equity to facilitate the participation of all people in social, economic and political life strengthening and encouraging the required relationships and institutions to achieve human enhancement and dignity as a means and an end (Fergusson, 2008). From this perspective public transportation is not a technical intervention but a means for social inclusion.

Mobility is a key dimension of social inclusion. Its importance is not founded on the possibility to move but in the possibility that this movement offers for individuals' access to resources that allow them to participate in social spaces and activities (Ureta, 2009). Transportation as a form of mobility is part people's options to reach desired goods, services, spaces and social activities. People experience exclusion because of a lack in these options or inequality in their access. (Ibid) People face exclusion because their choices are constricted by social, institutional and structural barriers and thus their freedom and human development are constrained.

Bearing this in mind, public transportation deeply influences processes of exclusion which must be addressed when evaluating the impact of these interventions in societal dynamics. Evaluations which ignore the relation between public transportation and human development can lead to adverse outcomes for more sustainable forms of development. For this reason, this analysis seeks to show how projects claimed a success from a narrowly economic perspective may be attested prejudicial from a human development perspective.

Concerned with the above, this paper seeks to contribute with the identification of elements and strategies for the analysis and evaluation of multidimensional development placing special attention on the processes of social inclusion in public transportation. The analysis highlights the evaluation process as a core element of study.

Methodologically the paper is divided into five sections including this introduction. In the second section there is an explanation of the main concepts, notions and variables used for the analysis. The main paradigm used is the human development approach which based on the recognition of rights and equity, enhances the human capabilities within social structures to achieve sustainable development (UNDP, 2010). Following this definition the analysis extracts its main principles as variables of study: Social progress as social development; Economy, growth and efficiency as an instrument to reduce inequalities and guarantee an availability of resources; Sustainability for future generations to also enjoy development; Equity understood in terms of outcome; Participation as an expansion of freedom and choices; and human safety as a required protection for individuals from chronic threats or deprivations (UNDP, 2010).

Following this, the notion of inclusive citizenship is introduced to examine the mechanisms by which the State should guarantee more inclusive societies. This

notion opposes the neoliberal model of citizenship and advocates for a citizenship that is bearer of rights over duties recognizing differences and diversity (Dagnino, 2007; Kabeer, 2005). It recognizes the means for people to access basic needs as rights and assigns the State a responsibility to guarantee this access in order to generate more inclusive processes.

Bearing this in mind the concepts of social exclusion and social inclusion are later introduced drawing special attention to that space where inclusion may generate conditions of exclusion (Silver, 2007) or adverse terms of incorporation (Hickey, Du Toit, 2007). The analysis uses the variables of recognition of diversity; substantive representation or participation and; a fair redistribution of resources (Fergusson, 2008) to define socially inclusive processes and projects. The selection of these variables is founded in their capacity to influence the fulfilment of substantive rights.

The variable of mobility is introduced as a central dimension of social inclusion and therefore an essential category influencing its dynamics. The importance of mobility regarding social inclusion is embedded in the possibility this offers to access spaces of participation to enhance capabilities and contribute to human development (Ureta, 2007).

Transportation is a means for mobility to facilitate access to social spaces and activities. Therefore a lack of comprehensive transportation options results in multiple forms of exclusion and marginality. For this reason, this section suggests the need to mainstream social exclusion in the evaluation of policies, programs and projects of public transportation and offers a challenge to address this matter in a multidimensional and multidisciplinary manner. Subsequently, it extracts some aspects to be considered when engaging in more inclusive forms of transport provision and emphasizes the importance of evaluating social inclusion in the system's structures and in the different stages of the project cycle.

The last part of this section begins with examining the general elements of the evaluation process, pointing out their political dimension and emphasizing their relation with different paradigms of development. Later, it explains some of the notions of the most commonly used method to evaluate public transportation projects today: the CBA technique; which is based in a rational tradition to measure development. In addition, the SIA is introduced to present alternative method of evaluation to assess this kind of projects. The theoretical basis, strengths, critiques and the application in relation with different paradigms of development of both

approaches to evaluation are presented to offer basic elements when analysing the adequacy of these techniques.

Based in the aspects outlined, the third section presents a basis of elements to be considered when evaluating social inclusion in public transportation. These are product of an interrelation of variables between the previously mentioned components of social inclusion and the defined principles from the human development approach. Taking this into consideration it focuses on how evaluations should address the identification of access needs, land use, mobility options and mobility substitutes using elements suggested by the VIT and the SEU. These guidelines are later contrasted with an evaluation document developed with a CBA technique to test their suitability.

The fourth section analyses the evaluation document of the BRT Lite in Lagos as a case study used to analyse evaluation documents on major urban public transportation interventions. This case was chosen for several reasons. One was the difficulty to find evaluations of implemented projects published by public authorities. This generated the question if whether evaluations are frequently done in ex post facto or if the outcomes of these interventions are ignored. It was easier to find assessments in a planning stage. SIA were found in few occasions and always in the planning stage. ^[2] On the other hand, finding published evaluations by public authorities using other techniques was an even greater difficulty. This limited the options to exemplify the application of other models through case analysis but reaffirmed the precedence of CBA as a leading assessing technique.

This case is also of particular interest because it portrays the guidelines used by at least by 35 countries in Africa today. ^[3]

The guidelines exposed in the third section are applied to this analysis, focusing on the evaluation process, mechanisms, methodologies, elements and indicators considered as well as the process undertaken at different stages of the project. The technique used to do the evaluation stands out as a variable that shapes processes and policies.

The last section presents the concluding remarks inviting to reflection while emphasizing the importance to consider the recommended aspects when mainstream social inclusion in public transportation. It highlights the need to apply an

²For example SIA documents for the analysis of the Gautrain Johannesburg

³These guidelines are part of an initiative developed by the SSATP; A partnership of 35 African countries.

integral analysis that goes beyond sectoral studies oriented strictly to the functioning of a system or a project to address social inclusive projects and processes and agrees with Marsden's statement understanding that "far from being merely a question of technological fix and economic investment in industrial productivity, effective development can be accomplished only if the social structural issues which inhibit or channel development are themselves addressed" (Marsden, Oakley, 1998, p. 17).

It was of central interest for this research to propose a flexible mechanism to learn from experience and "turn what may be a judgmental process of evaluation into a developmental process of learning and building from experience" ((Marsden, Oakley, 1998, p. 5).

2. POSITIONS, CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

The following section presents the main paradigms, concepts and variables considered to understand the importance of transportation for social inclusion. These linkages are understood from a social development perspective and include a notion of inclusive citizenship to define the role of States in promoting social development. A crosscutting variable is that of social inclusion which comprises mobility as a key dimension given the possibility this offers to access spaces for opportunity and participation. Transportation is defined as a means of mobility and therefore public transportation is understood an important field for policy planners and evaluators to respond with inclusive processes. In view of this, this section exposes a series of recommendations to consider when evaluating comprehensive public transportation provision. It also states that the assessment of public transport provision today seems to leave these linkages unattended and therefore examines the rationale of the CBA, being this most commonly used technique, while examining alternative models to consider when doing these evaluations.

2.1 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

The human development paradigm is a social development approach that places the individual in the centre of the analysis. In this paradigm of human centred development, good governance is based on social justice as a way to enlarge a person's capabilities, (capacities and abilities) and choices for individuals to achieve goals and pursue freedom. From this perspective development is about removing the obstacles such as weak mobility, ill health, discrimination, or lack of education that constitute impairments for individuals to access the resources that allow them to achieve their aspirations. (UNDP, 2010) The human development approach is a paradigm shaped by the UNDP based on notions of freedom and justice such as Sen's capabilities approach, Rawls theory of justice and rights based frameworks. As developed by the UNDP, this paradigm offers an alternative to evaluate human development, not only by using the measures of the Human Development Index (HDI) but by considering its fundamental principles and apply their comprehension in developmental interventions.

The Human Development Approach conceives the openness of individual capabilities and choices and their context specific nature, providing a flexible basis to evaluate development. However, the paradigm has a set of principles that are in the centre when examining developmental interventions. This, are stated as follows:

- **Social progress:** Focus is placed on social development and its function in increasing the coverage and access to knowledge, nutrition and well-being (UNDP, 2010).
- **Economics and efficiency** – Economic growth is an instrument to reduce inequalities and lead to social and human development and efficiency is to ensure availability of resources, particularly for excluded and vulnerable groups (Ibid).
- **Equity** - in terms of outcome, understood under the basis of social justice
- **Participation and freedom** – Focusing on democratic process, participation, empowerment, the guarantee of civil and political rights, and cultural freedom, especially for excluded or vulnerable groups (Ibid).
- **Sustainability** – The capability of future generations to access ecological, economic and social resources
- **Human security** – Offering the conditions for humans to counteract threats and have a safe daily life, particularly avoiding hunger, conflict and abrupt disturbances due to unemployment (Ibid).

The human development paradigm understands equity based on outcome. It evaluates the contribution of interventions based on improvements in people's lives. The improvements are measured using the fulfilment of their purposes as indicators (Ibid). Considering this, when evaluating public transportation the focus must be in an availability of resources to offer people a substantive over a formal access to reduce their threats and increases their choices in terms of outcome. The principles aforementioned as well as the focus in substantive rights and equity of outcome will be central variables when analysing evaluations for public transportation projects.

2.2 GOOD GOVERNANCE AS INCLUSIVE CITIZENSHIP

This segment on inclusive citizenship portrays the differences between the Neoliberal and Human Development approaches on citizenship and social inclusion in order to consider the role of the state in public transport provision.

From a social development perspective good governance is founded in notions of social justice and framed in rights based approaches (UNDP 2010). As such, it is concerned with civil and political rights that guarantee individual freedoms as well as with social and economic rights to protect individuals that have been left excluded

when unable to reach access to basic needs through the market (Kabeer, 2005). This comprehends a conception of citizens as bearers of these rights and thus includes the element of accountability, considering that the governments have to be responsive to the needs of citizens and held responsible if failing to respond to these needs (Ibid). This proposition of inclusive citizenship, contests neoliberal notions of citizenship where individuals are responsible to guarantee their own substance and the role of the state is at the most to enable their access to the market as the main mechanism to earn their required resources (Dagnino, 2007; Kabeer, 2005).

A main difference between these models is that although a neoliberal model recognizes the existence of universal rights its discourse has made legitimate the commodification of basic needs by defending freedom through the markets. A model of inclusive citizenship demands for the state to go beyond the recognition of rights to play a role as a guarantor of these by generating more inclusive processes and recognizing the difference and difficulties for some identities to reach them (Dagnino, 2007; Kabeer, 2005). This notion goes further to affirm that in order to achieve inclusion a shift from the acknowledgement of formal rights (that is the right to have rights) to the recognition of substantive rights (the right to have the rights fulfilled) is necessary (Dagnino, 2007; Kabeer, 2005).

This recognition of the State as a guarantor of rights based on a notion of substantive representation considers also the need to strengthen mechanisms to hold these institutions accountable (Kabeer, 2005). Accountability refers to the responsibility and answerability expected from public authorities over the use of their authority (Moncrieffe, 2007).

Related to this is the agreement that good governance has to commit and involve in the transformation of dominant practices that perpetuate exclusion. This position is important when recognizing the notions of citizenship adopted by the evaluation processes and its role in the generation of inclusive processes or exclusive outcomes.

2.3 THE MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS OF EXCLUSION

The following section provides a series of characteristics that define social exclusion. It focuses on its various dimensions to present the complexity of the reality faced by the socially excluded and focuses in the social relations that generate this exclusion to emphasize the relational character of this condition.

Social exclusion as a term has not reached consensus in a definition and even less agreement on its indicators or ways to measure it. However, there has been some level of agreement over some elements to compose a definition. Considering this, it “is usually defined as a dynamic process of progressive multidimensional rupturing of the ‘social bond’ at the individual and collective levels(...)Social exclusion precludes full participation in the normatively prescribed activities of a given society and denies access to information, resources, sociability, recognition, and identity, eroding self-respect and reducing capabilities to achieve personal goals” (Silver, 2007, p.1) As a process it deals with a variable of time and is not considered as structural or static. Moreover it appeals to the behaviours and characteristics of social relations in a given time and space where isolation is experienced in material and immaterial ways.

The nature of social exclusion is relational. This is embedded in the social relations that make or keep people under conditions of marginality. Under this definition, social exclusion is associated with the concept of chronic poverty where the focus is placed on its multidimensional character and in the relations and institutions that prevent individuals from overcoming conditions of poverty or throw them into this state (Shepperd, 2007; Harris, 2007; Green, Hulme, 2005). A wide debate pursues a clear distinction between these concepts (see Silver, 2007; Hickey, Du Toit, 2007), which, founded on the same socially relational principle are inevitably interlinked and mutually reinforced. For the effects of this paper it is important to consider how social exclusion by constituting a rupturing of the ‘social bond’ reinforces any condition of poverty and that poverty may be a cause or a result of this marginality.

As cited by Ureta, (2008) Richardson & Le identify four key elements that serve as useful criteria to classify and explain social exclusion.

1. **Multiple deprivations:** Category which refers to the fact that social exclusion is caused by constraints in different dimensions beyond income poverty or physical exclusion. Regarding an economic dimension it goes beyond a monetary lack to

consider the different assets or resources from which people face exclusion such as land, credit, food, other consumption goods, and the labour market (Silver, 2007). It considers that individuals are excluded from a variety of activities and spaces and that these are generally closely related and reinforced by the same condition of exclusion.

2. **Relativity:** Pointing out the specificity of this experience in relation to the context and emphasizing that the importance of different dimensions may vary depending on the values and priorities that particular groups and societies give to different activities, spaces and resources (Silver, 2007; Ureta, 2008). In industrial societies the most commonly mentioned factors that influence social exclusion are: Lack of employment (Hickey, Du Toit, 2007; Rodgers, 1995), presumably because in a neoliberal context individuals are valued in their capacity to produce or consume; Physical disabilities and cultural differences (Hickey, Du Toit, 2007; Rodgers, 1995), based in the same assumption and pointing out that a liberal model defines equality as sameness and shapes the world responding to the design of dominant identities, and; Spatial isolation (Hickey, Du Toit, 2007; Castells, 1977) which gives a physical impairment to access, and reinforces the separation between different places and identities.

3. **Agency:** As a relational condition exclusion implies agents that play an exclusive role as well as individuals who struggle with this exclusion in order to actively engage in their developmental processes (Silver, 2007).

4. **Dynamic:** Social exclusion is not a static condition. This may vary or stay the same in the future (Ibid).

Considering the above it may be appropriate to suggest that social exclusion is a socially relative stage that reflects the existence of multiple constraints and detrimental relations in a certain period of time, which separates or prevents individuals to access the resources that allow them to live a life they value. It is important to highlight that social exclusion is not absolute and that individuals hardly experience complete isolation from the society they inhabit.

2.4 SOCIAL INCLUSION: SOCIAL STRUGGLE AGAINST DEPRIVATIONS AND ADVERSITY

Social inclusion is a central condition to generate human development and thus is the crosscutting concept for this analysis. The following section offers an overview of

its definitions, debates and components in order to comprehend how these may be addressed in public transportation.

Social inclusion and social exclusion are not completely the opposite. Depending on a particular paradigm or standing point, conditions of social inclusion and social exclusion may co-exist. However, from a human development perspective, in ideal terms this coexistence would not be possible. To explain this and based in the principles of the Human Development Approach(UNDP,2010), this paper understands social inclusion as a social process in which social justice is substantive for all members in order to make possible that they can access the resources that allow them to live the life they value. As a social process it includes a dimension of dynamism and therefore the need to sustain fair conditions over time in variable circumstances. As a paramount model it implies that any form of social exclusion or adversity in the terms of incorporation represents falling out of this condition.

Borrowing WSSD definition,^[4] social inclusion will be defined as:

”the process of promoting the values, relations and institutions that enable all people to participate in social, economic and political life on the basis of equality of rights, equity and dignity” (Fergusson, 2008, p.6).

This definition refers to a social responsibility and an individual activity, where society provides all its members with substantive entitlements and access to physical and social spaces that enable them to participate and influence the decision making processes without constraints to their identities. By substantive entitlement and access it points out that society not only recognizes this participation as a right but effectively opens the spaces for this right to be exercised. Under this definition, social inclusion is a social process and as such is relational and context specific.

This definition differs from others that define inclusion as addition. It “excludes processes of social integration based on force that attempt to impose unitary identities on reluctant populations” (Ibid). Social inclusion as addition may be used from a neoliberal perspective to expand a creative, productive and consumer social base where society is conceived as a whole and an addition of individuals is justified under the rationale that this unity will provide the elements required to generate the

4 The concept used by the WSSD is "social Integration" . However, I decided to take the elements without replacing the name of the variable to be consistent with the notion of inclusion and avoid confusion with other definitions of social integration appealing to social addition and add up policies.

wealth that will translate in benefits for harmonic societies. However, social inclusion will only contribute to this if there is recognition, fairness in the distribution and the capacity to participate in the decisions that shape individual and social realities. When there is a lack of recognition of diversity, closed spaces or unfair distribution “social exclusion and inclusion are not perfect antonyms. “Individuals may be may be included in some respects while being excluded in others“ (Silver, 2007, p.1) or included in adverse terms (Hickey, Du Toit, 2007). For this reason, when dealing with inclusion is essential to analyse the terms of this incorporation.

Adverse incorporation, considers the terms under which individual or collectives are integrated into social, cultural, or economical systems and institutional arrangements (Hickey, Du Toit, 2007). It also deals with their ability to influence and change these conditions. (Ibid) Examples of adverse terms of incorporation include exploitative employment and abusive treatment which at the same time reinforce the difficulties to access opportunities and overcome these deprivations. Gender blind policies may also result in adverse incorporation. For example, in highly macho societies, women may be incorporated into a transport system in apparently equal conditions of access. However, if this incorporation does not address possible situations of harassment when using the system, the terms of women’s incorporation may be adverse.

In order to simplify the analysis over this matter, the proposed variables to analyse social inclusion and identify inclusive processes, products or policies will be the three main elements highlighted by Fergusson (2008):

1. **Recognition:** Understands and respects diversity
2. **Representation:** Provides a substantive ability to influence the decision-making arena through representation or direct participation
3. **Redistribution:** Distributes a “correct share of resources between individuals to prevent socioeconomic disparities and fragmentation in relation with different social identities” (Fergusson, 2008, p.6).

Bearing this in mind, the analysis views one of the concerns of the polity approach which seeks to identify how state and societal actors interact to make significant change and how the implementation of policies or projects can influence or impact on inclusive or exclusive processes (Houtzager, Moore, 2005).

In the political sphere, the spaces for individuals to influence interventions that impact their lives become key elements. “The ability of political actors to produce politics of inclusion is in large measure contingent on their ability to engineer fit with political institutions that grant some actors greater leverage in the policy process than others” (Ibid, 16). This derives from the basis of recognition for all members of a society to participate in these activities and considers the reflection and processes undertaken by the decision makers when managing these developments in terms of redistribution of resources and social justice.

Bearing this in mind, the analysis uses the main components of social inclusion: Recognition, representation and redistribution to examine the ways in which policy makers are evaluated in the provision of public transportation. It places special attention to the terms of incorporation of individuals in the system to provide an insight of the orientation and ability of state actors and interventions to generate inclusive processes.

2.4.1 Access as the link between mobility and inclusion

Mobility in this paper is understood as a central dimension of social inclusion and therefore a key aspect to consider when evaluating inclusive policies, projects and processes. The importance of mobility regarding social inclusion is not in the act to move but the possibility this movement offers to access spaces of participation and opportunity. Likewise, a lack of mobility inhibits the access to these spaces and therefore, having or lacking this mobility becomes a key dimension of what it means to be socially excluded (Ureta, 2007).

From this perspective, a condition of exclusion and marginality is seen in terms of inequality in the access, resulting in the inability of individuals or groups to participate in social or physical spaces that enhance their development and expand their choices. This disadvantage has been associated with a series of mechanisms that have a direct impact when controlling the access of people to certain areas. For example the accessibility or privatisation of spaces related to the commodification of land. The land market defines the management of towns, planning and policy implementation while impacting a context of behavioural patterns, social relations and legal socio economic definitions that generate inequalities and reinforce these. (Ibid) Social exclusion is widely associated with the domination of powerful identities over vulnerable identities and reinforced by inequalities to access markets as a central space where inequalities are confronted or reinforced.

Additionally, if spatial separation generates spatial disadvantage given a lack of mobility to reach desired spaces, other forms of exclusion will be reinforced. In areas where people experience a multiplicity of deprivations there are not only low levels of car ownership and precarious connections with poor availability of mobility options and long trips to other areas but the systems of public transport tend to be weak and expensive (Kenyon, Lyons, Rafferty et al., 2002). As one of the main features of social exclusion social barriers cause and reinforce this condition. As a result of a sort of muteness and invisibility secured by marginality, public transport appears also elusive to disadvantaged areas, “with the result that the neighbourhoods become ‘no go’ and ‘no exit’ communities” (Ibid, p.211) generating other forms of exclusion like poor participation in social and political networks or access to employment and job opportunities (Kenyon, Lyons, Rafferty, 2002).

Exclusion due to lack of mobility is also experienced by cultural, material or physical disadvantages. This is experienced when there are weak options or no options to reach the means that provide development or subsistence. Having these options is essential to overcome disadvantages or social impairments. Public transportation is one of these.

2.4.2 Transportation, mobility options and good governance

Transportation is defined in this paper as a means for mobility and therefore presented as a field where the State must generate options conducive to social inclusion. The paper suggests that inclusive transportation can achieve inclusion as an outcome while failing to address this would generate exclusion.

How is public transportation responsive to social needs and how should these interventions be evaluated when addressing social inclusion? These are two essential questions to consider when examining the links between social inclusion and public transportation in project evaluations.

Transportation is one of the means of mobility people have to access different spaces for development and as such, a lack of transportation options becomes a form of deprivation. Disparities in choices for transportation result in disparities for freedom and development. In terms of outcomes this reinforces deep inequalities because the identities who have these choices have also greater agency over their

time and space, thus more access to their functionalities and own development. Mobility today has also been comodified and as a consequence those who cannot pay for it are socially disadvantaged and excluded (Curriea, Stanley, 2008).

For this reason, the design and provision of inclusive options for travelling and the adequate accessibility of these must be a core objective of good governance and inclusive citizenship. Considering this, local institutions have the capacity and the responsibility to plan, implement and evaluate interventions responding effectively to social needs and opportunities (Litman, 2003). This demands that public transport systems are also conceived, implemented and evaluated in an inclusive way.

The Canadian VIT has proposed a series of elements to consider when evaluating the provision of transportation. Litman (2003) suggests examining the particular conditions needs, limitations, requirements and abilities of individuals to access required or desired spaces. He subsequently, states that a failure to respond effectively to these will produce transport related exclusion; reinforcing or generating deprivations based on denied access or unequal access to transportation (Ibid).

Litman (2003) uses the concept of basic mobility where transport provides the ability to access urban equipment or spaces for individuals to enhance their chances and gain safety. Such spaces are emergency services, health care, food and clothing, education and employment, public services, certain amount of recreational activities (Ibid). Additionally spaces related to political participation should be considered.

In view of this, a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of inclusive transportation provision must consider:

1. **Access needs:** The mobility needs of people based on the frequency they require or desire to access different spaces and the difficulties they may face to reach them (Litman 2003).
2. **Location and land use:** The existing opportunities in the area, distance to opportunities and physical conditions to access these (Ibid).
3. **Mobility options:** The diversity of transport options for people to access required or desired spaces (Ibid).
4. **Mobility substitutes:** Alternative technologies or services that reduce the need for transportation (Ibid).

Likewise, The SEU in the UK prepared a document (SEU, 2003) to mainstream social development issues to transport related forms of exclusion in transport policy. This also raised concerns about the existence of transport services as a link between the people and the opportunities. An overall intention of the examination was to understand how a lack of transportation reinforces social exclusion and how to design projects for inclusive transportation; contributing to governmental roles such as breaking up the cycle of the socially excluded by providing mechanisms for increased access to education, work, political participation, health service and recreational and leisure activities.

The document reflects an important effort to understand the impacts of transport in the lives of individuals and communities and addresses the responsibility of governments to mainstream transport issues in the analysis of different programs, projects and policies. It also recognises the need to address these issues in a multidisciplinary and context specific manner, including social participation in the assessment of the needs.

However, even though this document presents interesting questions regarding social needs and accessibility, it does not address the existence of different needs for different social identities. Focus was placed in socioeconomic differences and in lesser degree physical disabilities. The document placed attention in outcomes to generate inclusion; however, the recommendations were shaped in terms of structural opportunities to access the system. A focus in achieving these opportunities would have implied some work in sociological and procedural aspects.

Bearing this in mind, it is also important to analyse how equity is understood, in the delivery of public transportation. Litman (2003) suggests three ways to define these:

Horizontal Equity: Concerned with the allocation of resources based on a cost benefit relation and focusing on the efficiency with which the service can respond to consumer's demands (Ibid).

Vertical Equity: Concerned with an allocation of resources with consideration of income and social strata. It stands in a structural position where transport systems play a role in resource redistribution (Ibid).

Vertical Equity considering individuals Need and Ability to move: "Assumes that everyone should enjoy at least a basic level of mobility even if people with

special needs require extra resources. Vertical equity by need/ability tends to focus on: access for physically disabled people and support for transit and special mobility services” (Ibid, 3).

2.5 EVALUATION FOR INFRASTRUCTURE WITH DEVELOPMENT

Evaluations today do not include most of the linkages and aspects presented before, presumably because of the objective of these evaluations. For this reason this section considers the political dimension of evaluations. It also explores the rationale of the CBA, as the leading technique to assess transportation projects and introduces the SIA as an alternative tool for this kind of evaluations.

A core component when analysing the evaluations is the process when doing these. Being social exclusion a socially relational process, the linkages between the social objectives, the variables and the indicators considered as well as the approaches used to plan and evaluate these projects become key elements. The actors involved and the client for whom the evaluation is prepared are central to these linkages and therefore must be specially considered.

“Evaluations are concerned with both: what is politically feasible and what is technically desirable” (Thomas, Palfrey, 1999, p.61). Evaluations are concerned with ideological positions, availability of resources, moral principles and the political effects these may have when adopted. Overall evaluations are concerned with how to be useful and this widely relates to how can the impact the environment in which they are done (ibid).

Evaluations hold a political dimension. Even though evaluations are ideally envisioned to deliver impartial appraisals this is often challenged by the context in which the evaluation is prepared and the reason for which is prepared. Although a discussion over their complete neutrality is still on-going (Mohan, Sullivan, 2006) the influence of these in politics is many times clear.

Evaluation methods correspond to particular models of development and as such diagnose reality. The debate on which method to use embraces a wider debate of which developmental perspective to follow. Today, the shaping of realities and policy agendas is dominated by a neoliberal model dictating efficiency and wealth as a desirable end for development. This model assumes that social equity would trickle

down to society as a residual effect of economic growth and based on this assumption the methods used to measure development leave social dimensions practically unattended.

The neoliberal paradigm has proven to be unable to generate holistic and multidimensional social development. On the contrary it has reinforced inequalities and social exclusion. However, it continues claiming success supported by evaluations that support its processes and projects. The CBA is still the most used method to evaluate developmental interventions that comprise infrastructure or technological investment. Despite its multidimensional implications, transportation is still seen as a matter of technical engineering and thus commonly evaluated under this method.

The following section provides a series of basic elements to understand the rationale of this method and its methodological principles. Subsequently it introduces the SIA. This method is presented to examine an alternative to assess public transport interventions. This method is embedded in a social development approach and therefore not only focuses in fixed objectives but considers the positions of different stakeholders impacted by the undertaken projects and processes. It includes an analysis of efficiency recognising the need to have availability of resources to contribute to social sustainable development. SIA is recommended considering that public transportation projects as impacting a context, go beyond a mere arrangement of blocks or systems to the definition of patterns and behaviours in a society.

2.4.1 Cost Benefit Analysis

CBA is the first and most traditionally used technique to evaluate and plan developmental projects that comprise infrastructure. It is embedded under a positivist tradition to measure outcomes with exact and quantifiable indicators with an economic focus on measuring accomplished objectives. (Marsden, Oakley, 1998)

CBA assess the effectiveness and efficiency of interventions regarding the retribution of services in relation with the investment of resources (Marsden, Oakley et al., 1998; Carley, Bustello, 1984). To do so, fragmentizes the analysis of policies and projects in specific categories and assigns monetary values to economic and not

economic variables. When doing the different diagnosis it requires a series of assumptions to support the model of analysis (Carley, Bustello, 1984).

As any other planning and evaluation method it is an analytical technique. It is widely used to assess the desirability of future projects involving the valuation in monetary terms of everything associated with the costs and benefits of these. It quantifies all the variables regardless of their nature, assigning value arbitrarily to in many cases unquantifiable variables (Ibid).

This method follows a series of general steps:

1. Establishes an objective
2. Quantifies in economic terms the adverse implications resulting from the implementation of an alternative to meet that objective
3. Generates assumptions to foresee different outcomes in each of the alternatives and estimates the probability of these occurring
4. Evaluates the losses expected from the different alternatives
5. Chooses the best alternative (Ibid).

The choice of the best alternative responds to pre-established criteria and level of utility expected. It has always to offer society a net return as benefits quantified in economic terms and has to offer the most level of activity for a pre-established budget (Carley, Bustello, 1984; Marsden, Oakley, 1998).

As a mechanism to optimize resources it is used to identify if a given intervention is desirable to improve the quality of life of people using general criteria of efficiency. It is also used to compare costs and benefits between different alternatives to achieve the objectives. For these reasons CBA is conducted mainly to evaluate growth led projects.(Ibid)

CBA is not influenced by participatory processes unless these provide the information required to complete missing data. On the contrary, as expressed by Castells (1977, p. 249) it "is an instrument of meditation based on the 'power of experts' or on the knowledge of the possible, between the particular aims of the actors and certain overall objectives generally shared to a greater or lesser degree(...).Rationality is defined as adequation of means to objectives." Considering

this, participation may exist but as a means to offer efficiency to predetermined objectives.

Its main critiques are valuing arbitrarily unquantifiable variables; the fact that it does not address the problem of distribution and; an exaggerated aggregation of data (Carley, Bustello et al., 1984; Marsden, Oakley et al., 1998). Although cost benefit analysis offer the possibility to compare and contrast between different alternatives and is has proven to be an important tool when systematizing actions scientifically, it becomes a narrow instrument when mapping or evaluating social realities (Carley, Bustello, 1984; Marsden, Oakley, 1998).

Cost utility techniques suffer from an extreme aggregation and quantification of variables that reduces social relations to narrow statistical indicators. This misleads social analysis because of its inability to address the impact of the intervention in different social identities, particularly in the distribution of costs, benefits and power. Its focus in quantification is also an exclusive mechanism, blind and indifferent to the unquantifiable influences of the project which widely shape social dynamics. Considering its limitations, CBA may be highly valued as a process of analysis rather than a mechanism to optimize resources objective (Carley, Bustello, 1984).

However, and despite the links between public transportation and social inclusion, current public transportation evaluations are still mainly concerned with economic efficiency. Thus CBA techniques seem suitable methods. The values usually quantified are the costs related to the system; the reduction of travel time; perceptions of safety; and some social and environmental impacts considered “in the name of “full cost accounting” or “sustainable transportation” (Litman, 2003 p.3).

The analysis of environmental impacts are increasingly incorporated and supported by governmental regulations and frameworks. The measurement of social impacts through SIA and other techniques represents an advance in the field. However, a greater focus must be placed to go beyond the social acceptance or social risks of the project to develop mechanisms to understand the implications that these projects have in social outcomes such as social exclusion (Ibid).

2.4.2 Social Impact Assessment

In the late 1970's and early 1980's, new tools for evaluation emerged "with the increasing recognition of the complexity of developmental intervention, and the need to understand social and political processes, to expand and enrich economic analyses and to develop more appropriate tools in rapidly changing environments" (Marsden, Oakley, 1998, p. 16).

Social Impact Assessments resulted from the need to focus appropriately in socio economic issues. They grew along with the interest to include environmental issues as part of an integral focus to evaluate developmental interventions but lost visibility when gaining ground from the economic criteria, planning and project evaluation included mainly the analysis of environmental impacts without properly addressing socioeconomic problems. SIA then grew as a separate analytical technique from Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), yet maintaining its essential aim to integrate different disciplines in evaluation and planning processes (Carley, Bustello, 1984).

"SIA attempts to complement the study of natural or biophysical, environmental impacts with information on the social and socio economic impacts which may be associated with a new project, policy or program."(Ibid, p. 4) SIA places special attention to the changes in community processes, particularly observing relations and patterns of production, consumption and distribution of goods and services as well as changes associated with psychological, physiological, biological and demographical factors as well as the institutional impacts of supply and demand in goods and services. It considers the distribution of resources when analyzing community relations and examines the winners and losers derived of each intervention. SIA started to find its way including socio economic issues into the decision making process, in the analysis of macro industrial projects by showing the advantages of integrating community participation in the project planning process and demonstrating how this responds with benefits in the sustainability of the implementation (Carley, Bustello, 1984; Bews, 2003).

To make the analysis operational it uses subjective and objective measures considering direct impacts (due to the intervention) and indirect impacts (derived from the intervention) (Ibid).

Objective measures focus on the natural and man-made context in which the impacted community lives and focuses in the changes of economic, political, environmental and socio cultural aspects of the community. The indicators constructed for these categories are based in occurrences resulting from aspects such as environmental or behavioral changes. SIA considers objective measures as useful to describe levels of provision and potential alterations in that provision but also as an insufficient tool to describe a comprehensive social situation (Carley, Bustello,1984).

Subjective measures are therefore used to examine the psychological and social impacts in intangible aspects such as networks, relationships, sensations and community cohesion. They deal with perceptual aspects such as feelings, expectations and satisfactions to complement the analysis of a social reality mostly to identify priorities and acceptance in relation with a given intervention. (Ibid) SIA places important attention in the capacity of the project to deliver the services (Rockefeller Foundation, Goldman Sachs Foundation, 2003).

SIA proposes an interdisciplinary analysis where the different impacts of an intervention are addressed through public involvement, seeking to influence with the assessment of the participation, the decision making processes in public and private spheres (Carley,Bustello, 1984).

Traditional methods for the collection of the information are mainly interviews, surveys and focus groups (Ibid); Techniques today may also include different PRA and PLA tools.

The aim is to integrate planning activities, policy or project analysis and decision making processes based on two assumptions:

1. That it can predict in a reliable manner the acceptability and changes in social realities regarding a particular intervention,
2. That through its diagnosis it can influence on the variations or implementation of particular interventions (Ibid).

Considering that different projects are to be implemented in different contexts, SIA is not a systematized technique. This is one of its major critiques when considering its possibilities to compare and decide between different alternatives (Rockefeller Foundation, Goldman Sachs Foundation, 2003; Carley, Bustello, 1984). Other element for which this technique is criticized is the possibility that it offers for subjectivity and personal interpretations which may affect the diagnosis and decision making process (Rockefeller Foundation, Goldman Sachs Foundation, 2003; Carley,

Bustello, 1984). Likewise, SIA its difficult to integrate with other technical and rationale techniques, resulting in misrepresentation and mismatching goals, methods and strategies even for a same project (Rockefeller Foundation, Goldman Sachs Foundation, 2003).

Despite its limitations this method is proposed to evaluate development interventions that comprise infrastructure. It offers the possibility to analyse and identify deeper implications of external interventions considering patterns of behaviour and social alterations. It is also concerned with objective and quantifiable measures, recognizing the importance of efficiency to generate and maintain availability in the resources. Moreover, it reduces the risks of the projects while enhancing the possibilities of individuals opening spaces for participation, recognition and redistribution to influence the decision making processes of more inclusive projects. This method is also useful to evaluate the quantitative indicators analysing social perceptions and complement the analysis with the spatial influence of the intervention in the context where it operates.

3. KEY ASPECTS: MAINSTREAMING INCLUSION IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Being context relative, socially interpreted and multidimensional, a specific situation of social exclusion is hard to determine. However, the previous analysis has contributed with a series of commonalities to examine the processes of social inclusion in public transport evaluations. The following guidelines are conceived as a basis of elements to be considered when evaluating social inclusion in public transportation. These will further be contrasted by analysing an evaluation document based on a CBA technique to test their suitability to mainstream social inclusion in the evaluation of these projects.

A main consideration when evaluating social inclusion as well as transport related social inclusion; is that the processes are seen from a people centred perspective. Social inclusion and exclusion are socially experienced and founded in the constraints that impede individuals to access spaces for development and freedom. Therefore interventions to overcome social exclusion have to be oriented to enhance capabilities and remove the obstacles that keep people in marginality, poverty and exclusion. The evaluation of these accomplishments should be in terms of outcome understanding social inclusion as a process and an end. For this reason, evaluations regarding social development must address the dimensions of representation, redistribution and recognition in the projects evaluated in order to understand the implications of these in processes of social inclusion and exclusion. As an ethical principle the process of evaluation should be inclusive.

A common ground for social inclusive processes is the generation of conditions of social justice and equity based on recognition of diversity, substantive participation and a fair redistribution of resources (Fergusson, 2008). The comprehension of these categories in the evaluation must therefore crosscut the analysis and process of evaluation. Another crosscutting focus when evaluating social development should be placed in how the project defines the categories of: social progress; economy and efficiency; participation; sustainability, human safety and equity. This is important to understand how these categories relate and identify the objectives and orientation of the interventions. Some projects may have a strong emphasis on efficiency and thus use the other dimensions as means for this end. Others may understand participation and freedom as an end and orient the other categories to contribute to this aim. In order to support the analysis and identify how the projects assume development it is also important to contrast these definitions with those from the Human Development Approach.

To identify how the particular social conditions and identities are addressed in transportation interventions, the recommendations follow the criteria suggested by Litman(2003). The evaluation should therefore identify if the projects, policies or interventions include a comprehensive criteria to identify access needs, land use, mobility options and mobility substitutes for different identities. This criteria and process should also be followed when doing the evaluation in order to cross check evidence and findings.

Bearing this in mind and understanding the multiple dimensions of exclusion, a comprehensive evaluation must place special attention to identify how the intervention responds to categories of people who tend to suffer more social exclusion related to public transport and how the elements that affect them are addressed. [5] This is particularly important to analyse which are the terms of incorporation of vulnerable identities in the system to avoid misinterpretations of social inclusion built in adversity.

Regarding the dimension of equity, It is important to identify if the interventions seek to offer equity of opportunity: guaranteeing that the conditions to access are equal for everyone or equity of outcome: concerned with a substantive access of individuals to the resources in terms of accomplishments (UNDP, 2010; Litman, 2003). From a human development perspective substantive access is measured in terms of outcome.

Likewise, it is important to identify the category of equity by which the transportation project provides social justice and redistribution of resources; referring to Vertical equity, horizontal equity or horizontal equity based on needs and ability (Litman, 2003). Concerning horizontal equity, substantive affordability must be considered. In

5 Criteria adapted from Litman, 2003), Colombian Ministry of Social Protection, and International Organisation for Migration. This refer to:

- Low income families or individuals: Constraint by their ability to pay to access the service
- People who are unemployed or underemployed: Constraint by their ability to pay for the service but requiring of this mobility to seek or access their source of income
- People on social assistance and other programmes for disadvantaged groups: Frequency in the travelling
- Children, elderly: Special need for caring and protection
- People in conditions of poverty: Unable to pay to access the service
- People living in poor neighbourhoods: Generally in conditions of poverty with weak, expensive, insecure or distant systems of transport.
- People living in isolated neighbourhoods or rural locations: Tend to have limited public transport options.
- People with physical disabilities or health problems
- Women: Who may be constraint by conditions of social discrimination, limited access to public spaces, sexual harassment, insecurity or low income
- Ethnic and religious groups: Facing language and cultural barriers
- Racial minorities: Generally constraint by conditions of social discrimination, limited access to public spaces, insecurity or low income
- Illiterate: Inability to read information
- Internal displaced communities or migrants: with conditions of unemployment, language and racial barriers and discrimination
- Others: Context specific requirements and needs

terms of economic resources, this analysis could be based on a fair proportion of the individual's living costs. In terms of equity on need and ability, ensuring modifications of the structure even if more resources are required to remove inequalities in the access is the desirable.

Considering the aforementioned, and highlighting that different identities have different experiences and needs, an inclusive technique of evaluation must offer the possibility to disaggregate between identities influencing or being influenced by the intervention.

Considering the participatory and yet objective techniques of SIA, these are recommended in the evaluation of these influences. Additionally these may be useful to identify the contributions and impact of the intervention in the context where it operates. An evaluation using this technique could be useful to measure some outcomes in the dimensions of human development outlined. Overall recommendations are to consider social cohesion, community development and community associations as well as the engagement of people in political and decision making public activities taking into consideration the existence of open spaces for monitoring and accountability.

Regarding the sustainability of the project it can assess the financial and environmental sustainability as well as the built capacity for people to use the systems.

Appealing to the dimension of human safety, the evaluation can focus on effective links to knowledge and nutrition as well as increased safety and crime reduction in the area. Considering the above it can evaluate the project as a success from a holistic perspective where efficiency and sustainability benefit a broad diversity of groups including vulnerable identities and previously transport excluded groups.

SIA techniques are suggested to involve the community in the decision making process in the different stages of the project and the evaluation to approach transportation projects in a multidisciplinary manner. This in order to offer a system that provides greater space for participation and representation opening greater channels for accountability and transparency in developmental processes that are conceived to respond to the people.

An overreaching recommendation is a comprehensive evaluation which identifies how the community substantively participates and influences the planning and implementation process. In doing so, it shall place especial attention to the changes implemented considering peoples' participation and needs and also address the stakeholders who were considered in the decisions and the deliberative spaces for participation. Accordingly it is important to inspect what kind of information was disseminated and for whom. This in order to evaluate "the expansion of assets and capabilities of poor people to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control and hold accountable institutions that affect their lives" (Narayan in Eyben, 2003, p.17).

The aforementioned considerations guide the following case analysis. The intention is to test these recommendations by examining other process of evaluation and identify which of these aspects are recognised and how are they addressed.

4. BRT LITE LAGOS: THE EVALUATION OF A SUCCESS

The following case analysis uses the guidelines previously explained and focuses in the process by which the evaluation was done, who was it done for, and what were the direct and indirect products addressed. Having this into account it inspects some of the outcomes that the evaluation may have ignored in terms of social exclusion.

The publication of the evaluation of the BRT lite was funded by international donors, regional blocks and banks.^[6] This evaluation was published as a Discussion Paper in the Urban Transport Series of SSATP, “an international partnership to facilitate policy development and related capacity building in the transport sector in Sub-Saharan Africa” (Mobereola, 2009, p. iv). The discussion of the evaluation of the BRT is supposed to show the positive aspects of generating organised and effective public transport in order to achieve broader policies for development and replicate this model throughout the continent (UITP 2010). The aim of these policies is to achieve “safe, reliable, and cost-effective transport, freeing people to lift themselves out of poverty and helping countries to compete internationally” (Mobereola, 2009, p. iv).

The evaluation was done by a private consultancy firm guided by LAMATA in collaboration with the World Bank. The author of the document is the Managing Director of the LAMATA. The main approach to evaluate this project was a CBA which used SIA techniques to support the quantification of values.

“Evaluation of BRT-Lite has declared the scheme an unprecedented success, defining the critical success factors as being; significant and consistent political commitment, the presence and abilities of a strategic public transport authority in LAMATA, scheme definition that concentrates on essential user needs and deliverability within a budget and programme, the work undertaken to engage key stakeholders and ensure that those that benefit are multiple, and a community engagement programme that has ensured that BRT-Lite is seen as a community project created, owned and used by Lagosians” (Mobereola, 2009, p.2).

The BRT evaluation reviews the process in which the project was conceived and implemented to equate this with its final outcomes. It presents the most pressing transport problems of Lagos being the lack of articulation of a transport system,

6 Donors are the European Commission (main donor), Denmark, France, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, Islamic Development Bank, African Development Bank, and World Bank (host of the project's publication).

fluctuation in the prices for users, insecurity for passengers and traffic congestion.^[7] The evaluation of the process has a central interest in the consolidation of LAMATA and its role as a solid institution. However, the variables to evaluate the intervention are based on central characteristics defined by the Government and the World Bank and validated through a feasibility study undertaken in 2006. These are:

- **“Efficient service:** Low cost, high frequency, high speed, high occupation, high safety, low emissions
- **Adequate institutional and regulatory framework**
- **Significant socioeconomic benefits, especially for the low-income population**
- **Maximum private participation**
- **Minimum public expenditures and liability**
- **Adequate mitigation of environmental and social impacts of the BRT system”** (Mobereola, 2009, p.7).
-

The evaluation places great importance to the institutional dimension of the project. An analysis of this and its possible relation with the stakeholders for which the evaluation is prepared will be examined further. For the moment, the attention will be placed in the scheme used by LAMATA to Launch and implement the system BRT and the way in which this scheme is evaluated. This, in order to identify the methods and criteria used; the definition of variables; the processes undertaken; and the implications on this evaluation in terms of social inclusion for Lagosians.

As expressed, the conception of development is linked with the ways of measuring it. The main criterion under which this project is evaluated is efficiency. Efficiency understood as profitability and sustainability to deliver an adequate service for clients also referred to as “the travelling public”. Using mainly CBA techniques, the project is evaluated as efficient if it has the capacity to respond offering: low cost, high frequency in the services, high speed, high safety and low emissions. Social and environmental dimensions are located in this category. Sustainability was a crosscutting issue, which focused on the reduction of emissions as well as economic and institutional sustainability. Under this evaluation the objectives were successfully met (Mobereola, 2009).

7 “When new administrations were elected at the federal and state levels in 1999, transport was identified as one of the most pressing issues in Lagos State. In response, the governor, Bola Tinubu, appointed a special adviser on transportation and sought development assistance from the World Bank Group” (Mobereola, 2009, p.4).

Additional to these elements traditionally considered in an evaluation of efficient public transport, this evaluation also considered the comfort of the users when travelling, their safety when accessing and travelling and the reliability in the timetables (Ibid). All of these categories were evaluated as successfully in contributing to well-being, supported by highly graded satisfaction surveys.

Without a doubt, the aforementioned aspects are key elements to evaluate a cost effective and efficient transportation service. However, this form of evaluation needs to be reconsidered because it ignores wider implications of these interventions in societal dynamics. The CBA approach used to evaluate this BRT misled the interpretation of social processes such as recognition, participation, representation redistribution, equity social progress and human safety, supporting a socially exclusive process and project.

4.1 Misleading recognition

One of the most misrepresentative results in terms of development appears when analysing the way in which the evaluation addresses the recognition of diversity. The evaluation considers the “users” or “travelling public” and leaves those who are not able to access the service practically ignored and excluded. Furthermore, the analysis suggests that this project targets a medium to high socio economic level to provide the service and its ability to capture this group is what has led to this unprecedented success.

In their analysis of identities they expressed how the system was used by a broad range of people. Subsequently this was categorised in a wide majority being self-employed, or entrepreneurs and a great portion being civil servants and students. It was also valued as a major accomplishment of social progress the evidence of ridership in the high socio economic strata, highlighting that “even a small -proportion of previous car users (willing) to use the new system is testimony to a change in thinking in a society in which car ownership is an aspiration, marking a change in status from which people rarely retreat” (Mobereola, 2009, p. 36).

A common denominator when using CBA techniques is the lack of recognition of diversity. In the evaluation document the community was identified under 3 groups:

65% who did not have a car and could be captive of the BRT system, 25% who had a car but could be captive to the BRT system and a 10% that would least likely use the system but would be influential when communicating the benefits of the system (Mobereola, 2009).

An extreme categorisation and aggregation based on efficiency as the main criteria leaves no space to consider the conditions of those who are not accessing the system. According to the evaluation 82% of the users are employed or self-employed, suggesting that the access to the system is widely shaped by the needs of this population and by their ability to pay for it. Likewise, an analysis of outcome regarding accessibility the evaluation valued accessibility as the facility that the staff now had to go to work and move for business related activities. (Mobereola 2009).

However, unemployment in Nigeria is an increasing trend, basically in the young. As shown, unemployment is also a central condition of exclusion, reinforced by transport related exclusion. The fact that this is not even considered in a process of evaluation which measures the contributions of a public transport system for the development of a city builds even higher boundaries for these categories. The fact that this group is ignored because it is not an active consumer of the system reflects the impacts set by exclusive processes in conditions of multiple deprivations. This evaluation and the actions taken upon it reinforce the exclusion in Lagos in “the emergence of an increasingly marginalised and economically pauperised group” (Abiodun, 1997, p.220).

Considering this, the approach constitutes a reversal particularly in the dimension of human security, reinforcing the threats that individuals face in their life with the inability to respond to these by disruptive deprivations such as joblessness, which may increase their possibilities of suffering hunger, conflict and marginality.

4.2 Instrumental participation

The evaluation valued the participatory techniques incorporated to involve the community and identify travel behaviours as a key factor to understand the travellers' needs. As documented (Mobereola, 2009) these were ethnographic observation, quantitative and qualitative surveys and focus groups. These participatory processes were not conducted to identify the access needs, location and land use, mobility

options and mobility substitutes for residents. The participation was used to determine the values that travellers gave to units such as time and safety and to explore their perception regarding travelling in Lagos in order to “test the features that may or may not be applied within a BRT system” (Mobereola, 2009, p.9). The participatory techniques were used to measure levels of acceptance as a way to counteract possible risks of the project due to community discomfort and to quantify the values required to complete the CBA.

Considering the above, and bearing in mind this is an efficiency oriented evaluation, it is possible to sustain that this evaluation does not address key dimensions of socially inclusive transport. The evaluation does not report a concern for the access needs of traditionally vulnerable identities or their alternatives considering their location and access to opportunities. Presumably this is not included because the evaluation focuses in the dimension of mobility as articulation and decongestion not as access to opportunities and development.

Instead of applying SIA techniques to identify the access needs and concerns of the society to influence with this information the decision making process, participation was used as a means to implement pre-established objectives and gain acceptance by seemingly engaging the community. “The approach to consultation as a means of gathering information made a genuine and meaningful contribution to scheme development”(Mobereola, 2009).

Narrow approaches to diversity along with an instrumental participation are actually in the roots of the exclusive outcomes of the Lagos BRT Lite system.

Under the concept of sameness, evaluations based on these criteria continue to favour and shape policies blind to diversity which build barriers that reinforce exclusion. Subsequently, there appears to be a lack of studies to address the implications that this system has had in traditionally excluded identities. However, reactions symptomatic of socially exclusive processes arise claiming attention to diversity to Lagos BRT.

A protest by disabled persons was reported by the Nigerian Newswatch Magazine only 3 months after the BRT system began its operations. They claimed that “BRT buses together with other developmental projects of the government both at the

federal and state levels were being done without considering the interest of about 19 million Nigerians with disabilities” (Onyekwere, June 2008). Likewise, The Centre for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) established in Lagos on 2002, expressed how people with disability bemoaned that “the inaccessibility of the design of the BRT services, which limits access to the disabled and the elderly, and many other groups perpetuates exclusion” (Ekah, 1 September 2008).

The adverse incorporation of the disabled people in the system is only an example that illustrates the dichotomy where inclusion as add-on policies based on criteria of sameness may represent exclusion and marginality. A SIA is recommended as desirable only if used for understanding the needs and reality of those involved in the consultations and having the capacity to influence modifications when required. This could have also been a valuable technique to analyse winners and losers from different interventions to identify the terms by which some categories were included. This core dimension of what it means to be socially excluded was completely overlooked by the criteria and approach used in the BRT Lite evaluation.

4.3 Representation, participation and ‘top down’ ownership

One of the main accomplishments stated by the document was the sense of ownership of the Lagosians with the project. This was an objective of the process and as such, valued as an inclusive process which invited different stakeholders to participate. This however was done in an exclusive way.

The variables considered by the evaluation gave value to efficient ‘top down processes’ over substantive inclusive participation. The evaluation valued the fact that since the first stage, the project brought “international expertise in approaches that might meet the local needs”(Mobereola ,2009, p.8). Following the logic of cost benefit analysis, the decision on which alternatives and objectives to choose (kind of system, prices and route and infrastructural design among others), responded to a pre-established criteria based on an expected utility for a pre-established budget; Also highlighted as a success. In the same logic, there was an adequation of means for the accomplishment of the objectives where in closed spaces for participation the exercise was more of persuasion.

“The concept of a BRT system was the subject of an open discussion with the BRT Steering Committee, chaired by the commissioner for transport, and composed of key stakeholders. The group viewed an artist’s impressions of the median and bilateral operation of cars and buses on the chosen corridor, (...) Participants quickly recognized that the BRT system was not necessarily a long-term grand aspiration, but was instead something readily deliverable. The visualization showed immediately what benefit the system would bring to bus run times and consequently to those traveling along the corridor” (Mobereola, 2009, p.10).

However, a comprehensive analysis of this situation indicates that formal participation is not necessarily substantive when constraint by other mechanisms of power such as hierarchies and recognized authorities. This consideration is based on the notion of invisible power where an internal or implied sense of powerlessness limits the participation of individuals or communities where formal spaces for participation are provided. The sense of powerlessness is embedded in the inability to challenge visible powers due to unbalanced power relations (Eyben, 2005).

As CBA approaches are not concerned with the distribution of resources, being power one of them, a positive evaluation to participation may easily be one which has as an outcome exclusion and disempowerment. In this case, LAMATA is not as a guarantor of rights for users but as a regulatory power representing the government and private service providers. LAMATA has to promote and develop public transportation and administrate the system to provide the service and ensure cost recovery in the sector (LAMATA, 2010). These meetings were regulated by state authorities where community representatives were “invited to inform them how the system could operate and how the users would benefit.” (Mobereola, 2009, p.17).

On the other hand only ‘key’ stakeholders were invited. That is selected members of those “who were key to delivery and those who were guardians of the wider policy objectives” (Mobereola 2009; 8). The first group included the users who could be represented through community leaders and local government representatives and the second the service providers. The community representatives were previously selected.

The fact that these meetings were conceived in closed spaces underlines exercises of power that reinforce social exclusion. Membership and selection of members are one of the mechanisms through which dominant groups exercise *power over* subjugated groups or individuals. Explained in the words of Eyben, *Power over* is

“the exercise of power that inhibits and excludes people from participating in and sharing the benefits of development” (Eyben, 2005, p.20). From this notion, forms of participation with open access to the community tend to outcome in more substantive participation and representation.^[8]

The terms of incorporation in social inclusion are also concerned with the ability of individuals to influence the interventions that impact their lives. It deals with how individuals can modify particular decisions. Moreover, it considers the difference between formal and substantive rights and how the later may be constraint by asymmetric power relations. These factors are not addressed by the evaluation which only focuses on the formal structures that support the implementation of a programme or policy over substantive influence in the decision making process.

4.4 Compensation as redistribution

According to the evaluation central concerns raised from the users and addressed by the project were low cost of the service and accessibility.

In terms of access, the evaluation valued that the dissemination information on how to access and use the system was distributed in different languages, responding probably to an important migrant population in Lagos. This was seen as social progress because there was a more informed travel public recognising that many potential users did not access the system because they did not know how to use it. (Mobereola, 2009)

Regarding the price, significant benefits for the community in terms of redistribution were celebrated. This conception may be associated with paradigms with the objective is to increase human capital to generate growth and reduce poverty through redistribution in terms of benefits. In the BRT evaluation transport plays a role in redistributing wealth through a reduction of costs or subsidies.

This redistribution is understood under the rationale of vertical equity. Significant socioeconomic benefits, especially for the low income population were addressed when evaluating the project in terms of equity. When doing so it considered a better service without price fluctuation for everyone and a reduction of the tariff for the

⁸ See for example Dangino (2005) on participatory budgeting in Brazil

poorest users (apparently 4% of the total users categorised as 'informal workers' and probably some portion of 6% categorised as 'others').

A vertical equity based on needs and ability to move was considered as a need but not addressed. This redistribution was not oriented towards justice in access but to a monetary compensation without substantial modifications to guarantee equity of outcome as illustrated by the protest of the disabled. Accordingly, from this perspective, disconcerting statements such as those expressed by the chief executive officer, of LASTMA are approved. Arabamem, responding to the problems of accessibility declared that the disabled were considered because:

" they are supposed to ride without paying the fare, so recognition has been made and if they are supposed to ride without paying the fare, they should use the facility "(Ekah, 2008).

Well-being and equity are oriented towards efficiency and from the standing point of the evaluation that is a success. However this approach misses equity in the outcome as a critical dimension for sustainable development in terms of inclusion for opportunities.

4.5 Silent equity outcomes

Contrary to evaluate a project looking if it offers a link between the functionalities of different people with the resources to achieve them, this kind of evaluation supports exclusive projects that reinforce marginality. As shown, there is no focus on the outcome of the objectives.

A comprehensive evaluation for social development must understand the context in which a project operates to put the residents of that community in the centre of a developmental intervention. These are: children, elderly, women, migrants, physically challenged, illiterate, unemployed and other identities that have different needs and become vulnerable to transport related exclusion.

Essential dimensions of the social sector like access to employment, health or education are only included when analysing patterns of behaviour of the traveller. The analysis of these dimensions is only done when quantifying the effect on peak hours and is based on those who already reach these spaces.

Infrastructural projects cannot be implemented as a 'one size fits all' formulas. The unequal outcome for different members of society is the critical conflict of this assumption. The fact that this is not even mentioned in the document perpetuates the cycle of deprivation and adverse terms of incorporation of the neglected. Inequality in outcome is the major condition to perpetuate exclusion because it hides behind the marginality of the mute and invisible.

4.6 Evaluation as a variable

The shaping of policies

"If the larger purpose of evaluation is social betterment, the public-policy arena affords tremendous opportunities for evaluators to have both long and short term impacts by influencing policy formulation, implementation and outcomes" (Rakesh, Sullivan, 2006, p.8).

Considering this, the evaluation technique as well as the stakeholders for whom the evaluation is prepared must be considered as they highly determine the purpose and implications of the evaluation.

This evaluation was prepared by public authorities for donors. It was guided by LAMATA and the World Bank, the two main organisms that were to be assessed by the results for the implementation of the BRT in Lagos. The implementation of the BRT Lite is part of a World Bank's wider objective to implement the Lagos Urban Transport Project. Evaluations as judgemental documents, characteristic of third generation objective evaluations seek approval in the accomplishment of pre-established objectives to attain green light for continuity (Thomas,Palfrey, 1999). This evaluation seeks to approve a system regardless of an exclusive process with detrimental social outcomes because it is inserted in a development program shaped by a development model. This, beyond a policy matter is a political matter to sustain the dominant neoliberal model as the guiding paradigm.

Under a neoliberal model of citizenship social inclusion is not understood in terms of human development but as human productive capital. This closes spaces for citizens to claim their rights and erodes responsibility from the state to respond with inclusive projects and processes that contribute to people centred development. This reinforces the space between citizens and their governors limiting spaces for accountability and responsiveness.

Policies shaped by this paradigm narrow the responsibility of the states to a delivery role in a customer - provider relationship and as such exclude the most vulnerable sectors of society given their inability to access services through the market. On the other side, in the name of economic liberalism dominant and privileged groups have powerful mechanisms to maintain status quo. Reducing the size of the state results in limiting its role as a guarantor of rights and converting it, at the most in an enabler for consumption. This progressively increases inequalities making the poor poorer and the rich more powerful. In an international context this may be a reason for developed countries and multilateral banks to maintain the model.

Not only the approval of neoliberal policies and the fact that the evaluated were the same evaluators in this case closed spaces for accountability. The process of evaluation was in itself disempowering.

Representation and accountability

The establishment of institutions and procedures to respond to formal requirements resulted also in a lack of accountability and in social disempowerment. As expressed in the document, the different meetings with service providers and members of the community were preceded by LAMATA and the government “to ensure that LAMATA was not a faceless organization, to allow access to real decision makers, and to show accountability. The effect was to raise LAMATA’s profile in general, but also portray it as an organization that would listen and deliver”(Mobereola, 2009).

In the consultations to identify traveller needs, different members expressed, for example, problems with security in the area. These requirements were mentioned in the evaluation but the fact that these were not responded to was not addressed. The evaluation was particularly concerned with the system over the impact of the project

in its context. Subsequently, the only component of safety addressed was related with the operation of the system, regulating the speed of the buses. If the evaluation hides these results under a veil of irrelevance, spaces for citizens to recognize and claim their rights are closed.

It is in unequal outcomes or unattended claims where representative bodies should intervene to respond to their citizens. If they fail to do so they should be held accountable. However, mechanisms to hold this institution accountable were never mentioned in the evaluation. Further, the roles of the state were eroded by transference of responsibilities where individuals had to accommodate to the successes of efficient processes and the built environment.

This case, which is the case of 35 African countries, focuses on efficiency and sustainability only in an institutional level leaving unattended deeper implications in social inclusion and closing spaces for social and governmental reflection, disregarding dimensions for development such as recognition, redistribution and representation in different levels of society. Instead of working as a guarantor of processes for inclusive citizenship the state transfers these responsibilities to the private arena, regardless of its exclusive outcomes.

Other alternatives

SIA may not have the power to eliminate the political interests behind evaluations but as framed in a social development approach it seeks public involvement for a substantive fulfilment of rights contributing to processes of inclusive citizenship. As being inclusive, participatory and multidisciplinary, it opens spaces for the recognition of diversity and an analysis of redistribution based on needs, opportunities and possibilities. Likewise, SIA opens different channels for the stakeholders to demand answerability and responsiveness to the needs expressed or an inadequate use of the authority.

With the aim to integrate different disciplines into the analysis and mainstream social development in different project assessments SIA offers the possibility to analyse different features of to optimise the operation of a project increasing its efficiency for the enhancement of human capabilities.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this investigation was to identify a series of elements to consider when evaluating public transportation projects from a social development perspective. The objective of the paper responded to the overall concern that evaluations of public transportation, particularly using the CBA technique, ignores wider dimensions of social development, particularly the variable of social inclusion which is intrinsic to transportation as a means of mobility that provides access to social and physical spaces.

In order to respond to the objective, the analysis explored how public transportation contributed to social development by offering the means for people to access spaces for participation and opportunity. It also exposed how lacking this options for mobility resulted in the deepening of inequalities and social exclusion. This comprehension widened the scope under which public transportation should be conceived and thus evaluated.

Subsequently, the analysis explored how these interventions should be comprehensively evaluated in order to mainstream social inclusion in the analysis. In doing so, it identified and interrelated core variables regarding processes of social inclusion, guiding principles of a human development approach and key elements related to inclusive transportation systems based on access needs, possibilities and options for mobility.

These guidelines generated a basis of elements to be considered when evaluating social inclusion in public transportation and were contrasted by analysing the evaluation document of the BRT Lite Lagos. This was taken as a case where the evaluation claimed the transport system a success supported by a CBA method. The analysis revealed the limitations of the CBA technique and proved that the elements suggested were important to consider when evaluating process, policies or systems of public transportation.

The CBA as a leading method embedded in a neoliberal model for the evaluation of public transportation provision proved to be insufficient and detrimental to development from a people centred perspective. Additionally, it exposed the

convenience of its use to legitimate social exclusive process and outcomes which reinforce social exclusion and transport related social exclusion.

Among the limitations of the method the evaluation of the BRT Lite showed that this did not consider a fair distribution of resources or power relations, the vulnerability of different identities and a lack in substantive participation or representation. It also exposed how it did not take into consideration the access needs when assessing the effectiveness of the system and barely placed attention in the dimensions of social progress, human safety, and participation as freedom or equity in outcome. The result was a weak link between the transportation system and the opportunities of vulnerable identities, constituting a source of deprivation and reinforcing marginality.

The dimensions of social development were evaluated in terms of productivity and the improvement in quality of life measured in net returns of benefits for the community. Based on this, the implementation of the BRT intended to broaden the base of consumers to increase expected returns. This approach considered consumers over citizens only addressing the present and potential travel public. An extreme aggregation of data and a lack of substantive participation were justified under this approach if the expected outcomes and pre-established objectives were met. This evaluation reduced the society as: those with car, those without a car and those not likely to use the system because of car ownership. The evaluation left unattended those who could not access the system and focused on those with the means to access it. Only 4% of users are unemployed or in the informal sector and protests by disabled people were evidence of exclusive outcomes.

The evaluation valued the reduction in fees and provision of subsidies as an initiative for redistribution and social justice. However, this position left unattended a fair redistribution in terms of outcome. A redistribution seen as economic compensation did not consider modifications in terms of equity in ability to access. The case of the physically disabled represented an example where the state compensated with an exemption to pay the fee recognizing their inability to access the system.

The document valued the contribution of different stakeholders in the process but did not consider the mechanisms offered for participation. In the case analysed the spaces provided did not lead to a substantive outcome. A lack of consideration of the distribution of resources and power, protected the dynamics which exercise domination such as hierarchical meetings in closed and invited spaces with biased facilitation. Participation was valued as a means for efficiency and to counteract

risks of possible social resistance. Participatory methods were to assess risks and complete the required data for the CBA.

As a process the evaluation was not socially inclusive. The evaluation had the purpose to ensure the continuity of set objectives and respond to donor demands. This was not being accountable to the people. The method used and the fact that the evaluators were the same to be held accountable made it in itself exclusive and biased. The results provided covered problematic social realities misinforming the society and closing spaces for accountability in order to push set objectives. These objectives responded to a wider agenda in a Lagosian development plan shaped by neoliberal policies. The implementation of the system was also part of a neoliberal agenda to be pushed by the World Bank.

The policies and principles pushed by a neoliberal model promote process in which people have to earn their rights through the market and citizens gain their status based on their ability to consume. For this model the role of the state is to enable people to consume, eroding its responsibility as guarantor of rights. Projects conceived for the generation of wealth and efficiency as an end have proven to increase inequalities and protect those who want to maintain the status quo by excluding a great portion of society and reinforcing poverty with marginality. On the name of freedom based on economic liberalism dominant identities use various mechanisms to maintain their position. Such may be the case of the actors involved in this evaluation, which are recognised defenders of the neoliberal model for development. The evaluation used was a major instrument to ensure continuity regardless of the exclusive outcomes.

A social development perspective contests this model of development and advocates for equity and dignity based on rights. This is supported by the alternative of an inclusive citizenship which advocates for a state – citizen relation in which the state is a guarantor of rights and a generator of inclusive processes. For this reason this paper attempted to present elements to evaluate public transportation where the State commits with the needs of the poorest and generates processes and projects that respond to their needs. This responds to the belief that is in this participation and responsiveness where the roots of substantive representation lie as the genuine basis to ensure clear mechanisms for citizens to demand their rights. Is in this substantive representation where inclusive citizenship can be developed as a learning process leaving a door opened for evaluations to be made for the people shaping different paths development.

REFERENCES

Abiodun, Josephine Olu, 1997 'The challenge of growth and development in metropolitan lagos', in Rakodi Carole *The urban challenge in Africa: Growth and management of its large cities Mega cities*, United Nations University Press, Tokio, pp.192-222.

Bews, Neville (2003) Social Impact Assessments, theory and practice juxtaposed – Experience from a South African rapid rail project, paper presented at New Directions in Impact Assessment for Development: Methods and Practice, Enterprise Development Impact Assessment Information Service (EDIAIS), 24-25 November, 2003, pp. 1-16

Castells, Manuel, 1977. *The Urban Question, A Marxist Approach*. Edward Arnold, London.

Ekah, Mary 2008. *That the Disabled Too May Be Mobile*. [online] Lagos: Centre for citizens with disability CDC Available at: <http://www.ccdnigeria.org/news6.htm> [Accessed August 4 2010]

Currie, Graham, Janet Stanley, 2008 'Investigating Links between Social Capital and Public Transport', in *Transport Reviews*, Vol. 28 No 4 pp. 529 - 547

Eyben, Rosalynd 2005 'Linking power and poverty reduction', in Alsop Ruth (ed.) *Power rights and poverty: Concepts and connections*, The world Bank, Washington D.C, pp. 15-28.

Kabeer, Naila, (2005) *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*. Zed Books, London

Green, Maia, and David Hulme, 2005, 'From Correlates and Characteristics to Causes: Thinking about Poverty from a Chronic Poverty Perspective', in *World Development*, Vol. 33, No. 6, pp. 867-879

Hickey, Sam and Andries Du Toit, 2007. Adverse Incorporation, Social Exclusion and Chronic Poverty, CPRC *Working Paper 81*. Manchester: CPRC.

Houtzager, Peter P., Nick Moore 2005 *Changing Paths: International development and the new politics of inclusion*, University of Michigan Press.

Ferguson, Clare 2008. Promoting social integration in (UNDESA United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs), *Report commissioned for the Expert Group Meeting on Promoting Social Integration, Background Paper for Discussion*. Helsinki, Finland, 8-10 July 2008. Available at: <http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/SE6.pdf> [Accessed 10 July 2010].

Kenyon, Susan, Glenn Lyons, Jackie Rafferty 2002 'Transport and social exclusion: investigating the possibility of promoting inclusion through virtual mobility' in *Journal of Transport Geography* vol 10 pp. 207–219.

LAMATA, (n.d.) Improving standards and safety of transport in Lagos [online] Available at: <http://www.lamata-ng.com/LAMATA%20BROCHURE3updated%20-%20latest%20track%20changes%20accepted1.pdf> [Accessed 1 August 2010].

Litman, Todd 2003. Social Inclusion as a Transport Planning Issue in Canada in (Victoria Transport Policy Institute), *Contribution to the FIA Foundation G7 Comparison at the Transport and Social Exclusion G7 Comparison Seminar*. London, UK, April 4, 2003. Available at: http://www.vtpi.org/soc_ex.pdf [Accessed 1 July 2010].

Marsden, David and Peter Oakley (editors), 1998, *Evaluating Social Development Projects*, Oxfam publications, UK and Ireland.

Mobereola, Dayo 2009 'Lagos Bus Rapid Transit: Africa's first BRT scheme,' in *SSATP Discussion Paper No. 9 Urban Transport Series*, International bank for reconstruction and development, World Bank. [Online]: Available at: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/AFRICAEXT/EXTAFRR/EGTOPTRA/EXTAFRSUBSAHTRA/0,,menuPK:1513942~pagePK:64168427~piPK:64168435~theSitePK:1513930,00.html> [Accessed 2 July 2010].

Moncrieffe, J. M., 2007 'Accountability: Idea, Ideals, Constraints' in *Democratization*, Vol 8 No 3, pp. 26 — 50

Onyekwere, Joseph, 2008 'Protest of Disabled Persons' in *Newswatch Magazine*, [online] Available at:

<http://www.newswatchngr.com/editorial/allaccess/special/10615141958.htm>

[Accessed 10 August 2010].

SEU, Social Exclusion Unit [seupublications@odpm.gsi.gov.uk] 2003 '*Making the connections Final report on transport and social exclusion*', Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, England UK. Available at: http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/publications_1997_to_2006/making_transport_2003.pdf [Accessed 29 July 2010].

Shepherd, Andrew 2007. Understanding and explaining chronic poverty: An evolving framework for Phase III of CPRC's research, Overseas Development Institute (ODI). CPRC, *Working Paper 80*, CPRC: London

Silver, Hillary 2007. The process of social exclusion: the dynamics of an evolving concept. CPRC, *Working Paper 95*, CPRC: Brown

Rakesh, Mohan, Kathleen Sullivan, 2006 'Managing the politics of evaluation to achieve impact', in *New directions for evaluation*, Vol 112 pp. 7 - 23.

Rogers, Gerry, Charles Gore, Jose D Figueiredo, 1995 Social exclusion: Rhetoric, reality, responses: A Contribution to the World Summit for Social Development, International Institute for Labour Studies, United Nations Development Programme, ILO Publications, Geneva.

The Rockefeller Foundation, The Goldman Sachs Foundation, *Social Impact Assessment, a discussion among grant makers* [online] 2003 March 26 2003 New York City. Available at:

<http://www.riseproject.org/Social%20Impact%20Assessment.pdf> [Accessed August 20 2010]

United Nations Development Program UNDP 2010. [online] <http://hdr.undp.org/en/humandev/origins> [Accessed August 20 2010]

Ureta, Sebastian 2008 'To Move or Not to Move? Social exclusion, accessibility and daily mobility among the low-income population in Santiago. Chile,' in *Mobilities Vol. 3 No 2, pp.269 — 289.*

UITP- International Association of Public Transport *Public Transport in Sub-Saharan Africa Major trends and case studies* 2010. [online] available at: <http://www.uitp.org/knowledge/pdf/PTinSSAfr-Majortrendsandcasestudies.pdf> [Accessed August 9 2010]